

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Addiese: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P O Box 1450 Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.wepto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
10/533,847	11/30/2005	Fyodor Urnov	8325-0034 (S34-US1)	7879	
20855 7590 640772009 ROBINS & PASTERNAK 1731 EMBARCADERO ROAD			EXAMINER		
			SISSON, BRADLEY L		
SUITE 230 PALO ALTO.	CA 94303	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
			1634		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			04/07/2009	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/533,847	URNOV ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Bradley L. Sisson	1634		

	Bradley L. Sisson	1634					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED 30 March 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS AF	PPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	ALLOWANCE.					
application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this ication, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the cation in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time						
		in the final rejection whi	oboverio leter In				
no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, nowever, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TW MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 750 G/7().						
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filled is the date for purposes of determining the period of ext under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patient term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL.	tension and the corresponding amount of shortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing date	of the fee. The appropri- nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee te action; or (2) as				
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed w.	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the					
AMENDMENTS	idili die dilie period sectoral ili 57	SFR 41.57(a).					
The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, I (a) They raise new issues that would require further core			cause				
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in bet		lucing or simplifying t	he issues for				
appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a control NOTE:	corresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.					
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.116	21 See attached Notice of Non-Cor	mnliant Amendment (PTOL-324)				
 Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 		npilant / mioriani (
Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).	lowable if submitted in a separate, t	•					
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		l be entered and an e	xplanation of				
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:							
Claim(s) rejected to:							
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 1 and 6-15.							
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE							
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 							
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	vercome all rejections under appea	l and/or appellant fail	s to provide a				
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.				
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER							
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered bu See Continuation Sheet.		condition for allowan	ce because:				
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s) 13. ☑ Other: The replacement drawings filed 30 March 2009 are accepted							
10. M Outer. Intereplacement drawings liked 50 march 2005 are accepted.							
	/Bradley L. Sisson/ Primary Examiner Art Unit: 1634						

Continuation of 11, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

At pages 7-8 of the response submitted 30 March 2009, hereinafter the response, applicant asserts: "The pending claims are drawn to polynucleotides onlinculting arrays in which the polynucleotides consist only of sequences corresponding to accessible regions of cellular chromatin while the nucleic acids on the array disclosed by US Patent 6,153,379 (Caskey) are not limited to just those "sequences corresponding to accessible regions."

This argument also been considered and has not been found persuasive. For convenience, claim 2, the sole independent claim under consideration, is reproduced below in part:

"(a) the polynucleotide sequences consist of polynucleotide sequences corresponding to accessible regions of cellular chromatin and are isolated based on their altered reactivity to a probe of chromatin structure as compared to reactivity of bulk chromatin with the probe, wherein the polynucleotide sequences are at least 25 nucleotides in lentant.

A review of the disclosure fails to find a definition for what constitutes the metes and bounds of the expression "corresponding to accessible regions." In the absence of a specific definition, the clause has been construed as allowing for nucleic acids that have differences in the nucleotide sequence, e.g., members of the array may be considered to "correspond" of any nucleotide sequence found in any life form wherein the array member has any percentage of identical nucleotide sequence.

It is further noted that the "accessible regions of cellular chromatin" are not limited to just those sequences naturally found in any gene, much less any particular life form, but fairly encompass any mutated gene as well as any nucleic acid that may have been inserted into chromatin via any vector, such as used in gene therapy, or in the screening of potentially useful sequences.

In view of this expansive interpretation of the claimed array and in the absence of convincing evidence to the contrary, the members that the array is comprised of could well have virtually any and all possible nucleotide sequences. Accordingly, and in the absence of convincing evidence to the contrary, the rejection is maintained.